



PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

A LECTURE

BY

REV. JAMES MURPHY

DELIVERED IN THE

MECHANICS' HALL,

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1875,

WITH PREFACE AND APPENDIX.

FOR SALE BY D. & J. SADLIER & Co.,
275, NOTRE DAME STREET,
MONTREAL.

1875
(39)

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

A LECTURE

BY

REV. JAMES MURPHY

DELIVERED IN THE

MECHANICS' HALL,

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1875,

WITH PREFACE AND APPENDIX.

FOR SALE BY D. & J. SADLER & Co.,
275, NOTRE DAME STREET,
MONTREAL.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

A LECTURE

REV. JAMES MURPHY

DELIVERED IN 1878

MECHANICS HALL

PRINTED AT THE GAZETTE PRINTING HOUSE.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1878.

WITH PREFACE AND APPENDIX

FOR SALE BY J. A. J. SADDLER & CO.

215, 217, 219, D'ARCY STREET

MONTREAL

P R E F A C E .

In the Lecture on the Papal Infallibility which is now submitted in a printed form to the public, it is attempted, in the first place, to explain briefly what Papal Infallibility means, and in the second place to prove that Papal Infallibility as so explained is a fact. The Lecture, therefore, is not designed as an answer to objections, raised against the famous Vatican dogma. Such an answer will come in its time. But for the present the author restricts himself to showing that whether the difficulties against it can or cannot be met, the proposition that the Pope is infallible is true. He humbly requests that all who do him the honour of being his critics will keep this in mind. Either let them refute the arguments he uses, or let them admit that the Pope is infallible. That they can refute his arguments is what he quietly disbelieves. And when they have admitted that the Pope is infallible they will find him very willing to lend his little aid in dispelling all the outlying doubts that delay the acceptance of the Papal Infallibility. The author of this pamphlet invites scholarly criticism. But he deprecates vulgar insolence.

ST. BRIDGET, Montreal, 1st February, 1875.

APPENDIX

There is a large number of small islands in the Pacific Ocean, and it is not surprising that many of them have been discovered by accident. The first of these was discovered by the Spanish explorer, Vasco Nunez de Balboa, in 1500. He was sailing from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean, and he discovered the island of Cuba. This was the first of many islands that were discovered by accident. The second was discovered by the Spanish explorer, Christopher Columbus, in 1492. He was sailing from Europe to the Indies, and he discovered the island of Hispaniola. This was the first of many islands that were discovered by accident. The third was discovered by the Spanish explorer, Ferdinand Magellan, in 1519. He was sailing from Europe to the Indies, and he discovered the island of Mindanao. This was the first of many islands that were discovered by accident. The fourth was discovered by the Spanish explorer, Juan Sebastian Elcano, in 1519. He was sailing from Europe to the Indies, and he discovered the island of Cebu. This was the first of many islands that were discovered by accident. The fifth was discovered by the Spanish explorer, Miguel Lopez de Legazpi, in 1565. He was sailing from Europe to the Indies, and he discovered the island of Manila. This was the first of many islands that were discovered by accident. The sixth was discovered by the Spanish explorer, Ruy Lopez de Villalobos, in 1543. He was sailing from Europe to the Indies, and he discovered the island of Samar. This was the first of many islands that were discovered by accident. The seventh was discovered by the Spanish explorer, Sebastian del Cano, in 1519. He was sailing from Europe to the Indies, and he discovered the island of Celebes. This was the first of many islands that were discovered by accident. The eighth was discovered by the Spanish explorer, Juan de Salcedo, in 1564. He was sailing from Europe to the Indies, and he discovered the island of Luzon. This was the first of many islands that were discovered by accident. The ninth was discovered by the Spanish explorer, Juan de Salcedo, in 1564. He was sailing from Europe to the Indies, and he discovered the island of Mindanao. This was the first of many islands that were discovered by accident. The tenth was discovered by the Spanish explorer, Juan de Salcedo, in 1564. He was sailing from Europe to the Indies, and he discovered the island of Luzon. This was the first of many islands that were discovered by accident.

The first of these islands was discovered by the Spanish explorer, Vasco Nunez de Balboa, in 1500.

LECTURE.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

It is one of the saddest of all the sad perversities of modern life, that Christianity, which of itself binds men into a loving brotherhood, is often made a means of putting them against each other in bitter animosity. The intensity of theologic hate and the rancour of religious dissension are proverbial. Nor at this need we feel surprise. The worst is the best corrupted; the lowest of the devils was once the highest of the angels; and, as long as Satan is in this universe, it is the preeminently sacred that he will try preeminently to profane.

But I, when on this evening I bring before you a controversial subject, one, too, which has disturbed the balance of many minds, I will not, in any way, sacrifice Christian charity to controversial effect. What I have to say I will say in the most measured manner, and with the tenderest regard for those whose opinions are not my own. And, lest the influence of emotion should make me less guarded, I will, this evening, be as unimpassioned as my natural and national infirmities will allow. Very grave I propose to be. Being grave, I shall perhaps (and not unnaturally) be somewhat heavy. But my subject is one on which to trifle would be, at least, to insult. And then, an audience such as I have the honour of addressing now, has been educated above the level of the stump, and will appreciate the keener pleasure, and relish the keener air, of the clear cold heights, where reason, quiet and calm and self-concentred, rules.

My subject is Papal Infallibility. Many considerations, not the least being that blunders about its meaning are daily made even by able minds, force me in the outset to tell very plainly what Papal Infallibility means. By it, then, is meant this and this only, that when the Pope, in his capacity of Pope, that is, as the official Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, declares to the Universal Church that she is to believe a doctrine appertaining to Faith or Morals, that doctrine is and must be true. The ordinary formula, useful for its scholastic compactness, is that the Pope is infallible when he speaks *ex-cathedra*. That last phrase, Mr. Gladstone

informs the British public, has even among ourselves no received and rigid definition. The ex-Prime Minister is a distinguished Statesman; he is, I think, not indeed a man of genius, but a man of certainly high ability; he is undoubtedly an accomplished Homeric Scholar; but his knowledge of the Latin tongue seems to be very limited indeed. In the very Vatican decree which he undertook to analyse and in which the Pope's Infallibility is proclaimed, the phrase *ex-cathedra* is expressly and exhaustively and with inimitable theological precision explained. This is not the place to quote Latin; but even in an English rendering of the decree, Mr. Gladstone's fitness for the office of theological critic will be amply apparent. This then is the decree:—"We teach that the Roman Pontiff is infallible when he speaks *ex-cathedra*, that is"—mark how the Council explains the phrase—"that is when exercising the office of Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, he in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, defines that a doctrine of faith or morals is to be held by the Universal Church." Than that for any one acquainted with theological phraseology—and Mr. Gladstone has that pretension—nothing could be plainer. But for the ordinary secular mind it is susceptible of simplification. The Pope then can be regarded in many ways. For instance, he may be an author and write books; he may be a preacher and deliver sermons; he may be, and was, and by right is still the temporal ruler of a certain temporal state; he is (as yet) master of the Vatican palace; and he is Pope or Supreme Ruler, Pastor, and Teacher of the Universal Church. It is only in that last capacity that he possesses the Cathedra or Chair of Peter, and it is only in that last capacity that he has been declared infallible. And in that last capacity he is said to speak *ex-cathedra* or from the Chair just as the Queen's words spoken by her as Queen are said to be spoken *from the Throne*. Nor, when it is said that the Pope teaching the Universal Church is infallible, is that said without limitations. He is supposed to be speaking of things that appertain to the office, not of a secular, but of a religious teacher; and such things fall under the general heads of Faith, what we are by God's Law to believe, and Morals, what we ought by God's Law to do. Nor do we claim for our Pope what the English law-books claim for the English Sovereign, that he can commit no sin. Infallibility simply preserves him from error in teaching the Church; and as every Judge and Professor knows a man may teach very correctly without leading a life of the most elevated perfection. Nor, furthermore is it to be imagined that the

Pope's Infallibility makes him omniscient, or even enables him to dispense entirely with these ordinary processes for the discovery of truth which humanity has down here to follow. He is infallible by virtue of the divine assistance, but the divine assistance does not relieve him of the obligation of co-operating with it to the best of his ability. Before he defines a doctrine, if it be not already abundantly clear, he must by study, by counsel, and by prayer try to satisfy himself that what he proposes to define is true; and if he, in the case supposed, neglect this duty of investigation, he is guilty of a grievous crime. But even though he be guilty of such gross negligence his definition when it comes will not suffer thereby. It will, when it is given, no matter what the state of the Pope's conscience, be infallibly true. And that solely and simply because of the pledged word of Almighty God. For, as the Vatican Council puts down in as many words, it is by the divine assistance solemnly promised to him in the person of the Blessed Peter that the Pope is infallible. If God has made that promise, God will keep it. That God has made that promise I proceed at once to prove. And though the Pope might be well infallible even with the Bible silent about his infallibility—the Bible neither giving nor pretending to give a complete catalogue of Christian doctrines, neither destined nor professing to be destined for a complete exposition of Christian Faith, but on the very face of it being a collection of documents—all inspired—but written only for purely passing and accidental emergencies; though all this is true, I do yet from the Bible, and that the Protestant Bible, undertake to prove the Papal Infallibility. And though from the nature of the case I must be very brief, I shall, I think, produce such a proof as to any one who gives it logical fair-play will leave little to be desired.

In the last chapter of Mathew's Gospel, we read these words addressed by Christ to his eleven Apostles—Judas was gone to his account, and Mathias was not as yet elected—"All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye therefore and teach all nations, * * teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo! I am with you alway even to the end of the world;" and in the parallel passage of Mark, these additional words are found: "he that believeth not shall be damned." You here observe a certain set of men, eleven in number, marked off from all others; in virtue of His universal power, Christ endues them with the teaching office; they are endued with that office for all His Doctrine; and they are endued with it not for one nation,

but for all. The first inference is that these eleven have got a monopoly of teaching, and that these, and these alone, are all men bound to believe. Furthermore, these men are to teach for all days, even in the 19th century, even to the end of the world; still these eleven identical men are not made immortal and really live only a few short years. The second inference, therefore, is, that these eleven men are in each age to have successors, who also will have a monopoly of the teaching office, whom also and whom alone all men will be bound to believe. Therefore, at this very moment, there must be upon the earth some body of men who have divine authority to teach; who have a monopoly of the teaching office; whom all men beside are bound to believe. But that body of men, wherever it be, can it teach error? If it can, then first of all, God commanding me under pain of damnation, to believe that body of men, commands me under pain of damnation to believe a lie. But that I hope is clearly absurd. Therefore that body of men cannot teach a lie. Therefore it is infallible. But on the earth to-day, there is no body of men, with any of the characteristics of a body, that even claims the teaching office and claims a monopoly of that office, and in the exercise of that office claims Infallibility, except the collective Bishops of our Church. Therefore since such an infallible body there must be, and our Bishops alone claim to be it, our Bishops collectively and as a body are infallible. But our Bishops collectively and as a body have declared the infallibility of the Pope. Therefore the Pope is infallible. But, in the second place, the same thing is stated in the text yet more directly. Christ's words are "go ye and teach all nations * * and behold I am with you all days, even to the end of the world." The person speaking is God. God says that *with* the eleven in their teaching, He *will be* till the end of time. Therefore He pledges Himself *to be with* those successors of the eleven by whom, in each age, the eleven will be replaced. But as every student of the Bible knows, when God promises *to be with* a person in doing anything, God's promise has a certain definite meaning. It means that in doing that thing, the person cannot fail. "I am with you," He says to Moses; "I am with you," He says to Isaias; as a conclusive argument, that they need not fear, for they cannot fail. Therefore in teaching, the successors of the eleven cannot fail. Now what they are to teach is God's truth. But it would be a rather remarkable failure, if these men with their monopoly of teaching, and with all men bound to believe them, did ever, even once, for God's truth teach the devil's

lie. Therefore, these eleven Apostles as a body, and their successors in each age as a body, cannot teach a lie. Therefore, they are infallible. But again, to these eleven Apostles, infallible as a body, there cannot be on the earth to day an infallible body of successors, for no body claims to be it, except the collective Bishops of our Church. Therefore, these Bishops are as a body infallible. But again, they have pronounced one of their number, the Pope, to have the personal gift of infallibility. Therefore, the Pope has that gift, and is infallible.

So far. Now take another text. In that just cited, Christ addresses the eleven as a body; in that to be cited now, He addresses Peter alone. The event described occurred after our Lord's resurrection, and the description of it is found in the last chapter of the Gospel of John. "Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, 'lovest thou Me more than these? he saith unto Him, Yea, Lord, 'thou knowest that I love thee; He saith unto him, feed my lambs. "He saith unto him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, 'lovest thou me? he saith unto Him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest that "I love thee; He saith unto him, feed my sheep. He saith unto "him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? Peter "was grieved because He said unto him the third time, lovest thou "Me? And he said unto Him, Lord, thou knowest all things, thou "knowest that I love thee; Jesus saith unto him, feed my sheep." There is in that text something very worthy of consideration. The eleven Apostles are present, but only to one of them does Christ speak. And to that one, (Peter,) in the very presence of the remaining ten, does Christ with great solemnity give some power which to the remaining ten is pointedly denied. The power is, to feed Christ's entire flock, without exception, both the sheep thereof and the lambs. But by feeding Christ's flock (known also to be one, and to have but one shepherd) is meant, of course, teaching all Christians what they are to believe and what they are to do. Therefore is Peter appointed to teach all the flock, without exception, the ten other pastors present included. Therefore what Peter teaches these ten, these ten are bound to believe; and only what he teaches them or permits them to teach can they teach others. But suppose he taught error. Then they would have to teach error. Then he and they together would be teachers of error. But by the text of Matthew already cited, that cannot be, for by that text he and they together are infallible. Therefore he cannot teach error, nor ask them, nor permit them to teach error to others. Therefore he is

infallible. But the office of the eleven, and therefore his office as teacher of the ten, is to last till the end of time. Therefore there is on the earth to-day some man, successor of Peter, and infallible. But no man even claims to be either one or the other except the Pope. Therefore the Pope is infallible.

But there is yet much more in the Bible. I have already given you something from Matthew and something from John; let me now give you something from Luke. On the night preceding the Passion of our Lord, He and the twelve were met to eat their last earthly meal together. The Apostles as yet were rude, unenlightened men, and so, even in that solemn hour when the awful shadows of Olivet and Calvary were fast gathering about their Master's brows, they, with the unconscious cruelty of ignorance, saddened His great heart by vulgar wrangling among themselves. With that gentle, sad solemnity with which he always spoke to sinners, He rebuked them all. But he did more. This time again he turned to one especial member of their body, and this time again the one was Peter. I crave earnest attention to the words He uses, and I beg it to be remembered that these words are used on the occasion of wrangling and dissension among the twelve. The words will be found in the 22nd chapter of St. Luke. "Simon, Simon," says the Lord, with solemn reiteration, "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to 'have ye, that he may sift ye as wheat; but I have prayed for thee 'that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted,' for Peter was to deny Him, 'strengthen thy brethern.'" To that text, I apprehend, little need be added. Satan, says Christ, is doing his bitterest to destroy you all, and thus to end my Church, as he thinks he is going to end myself. But I will baulk him. And I will baulk him in this way. The faith of you, Peter, I engage to keep secure, and your own faith being thus established, do you establish the faith of your brethren. Therefore the faith of Peter is established. Therefore Peter is infallible. But the motive for making him infallible is to prevent Satan from ruining the remaining Church teachers. But that motive extends far beyond Peter's time, even to the end of days, for even to the end of days will Satan assail the teachers of the Church. Therefore not only was Peter infallible but in each age some man succeeding to Peter's office is infallible too. But again no one claims either to be Peter's successor or to be infallible except the Pope. Therefore the Pope is Peter's successor and is infallible.

his office as
therefore there
and infallible.
except the

already given
John; let me
preceding the
eat their last
unenlightened
l shadows of
ster's brows,
ed His great
that gentle,
He rebuked
turned to one
ne was Peter.
beg it to be
of wrangling
found in the
e Lord, with
h desired to
ayed for *thee*
1," for Peter
at text, I ap-
doing his bit
as he thinks
d I will baulk
keep secure,
lish the faith
established.
making him
ning Church
s time, even
Satan assail
eter infallible
is infallible
essor or to be
er's successor

* Only to one other text shall I at present direct attention. It is found in the 16th chapter of St. Matthew. The Evangelist there records how Simon Peter having made, in a very remarkable manner, a bold open profession of faith in our Lord's divinity—a profession of faith which was under the circumstances very unexpected—our Lord addresses to this Simon the fisherman, the following solemn and weighty words: "Blessed art thou Simon Barjona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven: And I say to thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: And I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven." Upon that passage, so splendidly suggestive, I limit myself at present to a few remarks. The word "Peter," in the phrase "thou art Peter," is, as most know, only an Anglicized form of a certain Greek word, admitted too in the Latin language, and meaning Rock. Our Lord, therefore, unto Simon, son of John, says simply "thou art Rock," signifying to him, as the sequel shows, his new office and his new name. The Saviour then proceeds to state His intention of building a Church, and that Church he characterizes, in other phrase, as one that will last for ever. "Pray you hold the figure fast." Keep in mind, ladies and gentlemen, that the Church which our Lord speaks of is represented by Him as a single edifice which he proposes to erect. That edifice, that Church, wants a foundation, even from the beginning. Simon, son of John, is selected by our Lord to be that Rock-foundation. But the Church is to endure forever, and as long as it endures it will of course require its foundation to sustain it. Therefore either Simon the Rock must in his own person support the Church for ever, or men must in each age succeed to him, each of whom will do for the Church in his day what in Simon's day was done for it by Simon. But in his own person Simon the Rock did not remain with the Church. Therefore he had, and has, and will always have, a successor to his office of Rock-foundation of the Church. Therefore there is upon the earth at this very instant some Church built by Christ, some congregation of men established and unified by Him as a single edifice; and as the

* This argument the author had, in delivering his Lecture, to state only in substance. Even as developed here he does not consider that anything like justice is done it. But his critics may give him an opportunity which he does not like to create for himself.

foundation of that Church, and ruler of that community, there is to-day some man who does in the nineteenth century what Simon did in the first. And that Church is Christ's Church, His only one—"My Church" He calls it—; and that man is the man who, and who alone, has the keys of the Kingdom of heaven. That reaches very far. But the text goes much farther. For Christ says of his Church not merely that she will last for ever, but He says specifically of her that against her "the gates of hell shall never prevail." Now by the "gates of hell," as all scholars know, and as is evident enough even to the unscholastic, is meant all the forces of Satan. The forces of Satan are manifold; but (as all know) they are principally two, and these two are moral sin, which diseases the will, and religious error, which diseases the intelligence. Therefore against the Church religious error can never prevail; by religious error the Church can never be, even for an instant, vanquished. But if the Church herself did for one instant believe religious error, in that instant religious error would be her conqueror. Therefore she can never even for an instant believe in religion what is untrue. Therefore she, the Church, founded on Simon the Rock, is infallible. But if the Church herself be firm against her foe, religious error,—how firm also must be her Rock—foundation! If a certain community, one and single as an edifice, be unconquerable by error, what must be the invincibility of the man by being centred and unified in whom it is that the community is secure? If the Church be infallible, therefore, her rock foundation is infallible too. But the Church is, as we saw, infallible. Therefore, as that Church must be existing now, and as she must be existing now with her Rock-foundation, there must be upon the earth some one community of Christians, single as an edifice, with the gift of infallibility; and in that community there must be some one man, centre and ruler and support of that community, he also being infallible. But upon this earth to-day no man even claims such an office but the Pope. Therefore the Pope is infallible.

These are the only direct scriptural arguments which I can at present venture to use. Springing out of them, however, there is one other which not so much for its own sake as for the sake of one of its far-reaching corollaries, I shall indicate in passing. Whether the Pope be or be not infallible, he is at all events the official ruler and teacher of all Christ's Church. That he is the law-maker of the Church, and that all the Church is bound to obey his laws; that he is the teacher of the Church, and that all the Church is

ity, there is
 t Simon did
 s only one—
 an who, and
 That reaches
 t says of his
 ys specifically
 avail." Now
 ident enough
 Satan. The
 re principally
 will, and re-
 e against the
 ous error the
 . But if the
 or, in that in-
 efore she can
 true. There-
 fallible. But
 s error,—how
 n community,
 r, what must
 ified in whom
 be infallible,
 he Church is,
 st be existing
 ck-foundation,
 ristians, single
 at community
 pport of that
 arth to-day no
 ore the Pope

ich I can at
 ever, there is
 r the sake of
 ing. Whether
 e official ruler
 law-maker c
 ey his laws;
 he Church is

bound to obey his teaching—this I assume against * Gallicans, for they admit it, against Protestants, for against them it has been, I think, fairly proved. I assume moreover, against both, and for the same reasons, that the Church herself is infallible and cannot possibly believe a lie. But with these assumptions, the inference that the Pope is infallible, is immediate and irresistible. That a Church which cannot believe a lie, should be bound to believe a man who may tell her lies, is nonsense. If the Church is infallible the man appointed as the teacher, whom she is bound to believe, must evidently be infallible too. But it is not to this very simple argument that I now wish to draw attention. It is to one of its corollaries that I ask you to attend. That corollary at once by one downstroke, disposes of all that Gladstonian verbiage about the novelty of the doctrine of the Pope's Infallibility. The Infallibility of the Pope is a doctrine as old as the doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy, and that latter dates from the Church's commencement. Neither did the Popes wait nor could the Popes wait to have their Infallibility defined. They must all from first to last assume it as certain and indispensable. For they all, from first to last, had to teach and legislate. But how could a man who was not certain of his knowing the truth have the hardihood to teach a Church which must believe him and could not believe a lie? How could God, if He made the Church infallible, and therefore incapable of believing a lie, how could He order her to believe a Pope and yet leave it in the Pope's reach to tell her lies? By making her infallible, He told her, "you cannot believe a lie;" by obliging her to believe a man who might be a liar, He told her, "you must, if that man wishes it, believe a lie." That is, He told her, "you must believe what you cannot believe." That this is absurd, I need not tell you. But even to this absurdity, are

* By *Gallicans* I intend to designate the few unimportant Catholics, who, before the Vatican Council, denied the Papal Infallibility; and the few very unimportant heretics—calling themselves Catholics—who since the Vatican Council have done the same. When I speak of the opponents of Papal Infallibility who lived before 1870, as unimportant, I am prepared to hear some allusion to Bossuet. Among all the Church's children of modern years, Bossuet is the one whom I admire and venerate and love the most. I am very unlikely therefore to desire, by any remark of mine, to lessen his great fame. But should his name be introduced by any of my critics, I think I shall be able to prove that the Eagle of Meaux would have scarcely desired association with the fowl that cackle after Dr. Doellinger.

we brought by the wise men who call Papal Infallibility a new doctrine. They are not learned enough, these wise men, to be acquainted with that alphabetic bit of theological teaching, that, namely, a *doctrine* is one thing and a *dogma* quite another. The Divinity of Christ was not a dogma till the Council of Nice; Mr. Gladstone, I hope, admits that even from the commencement of the Church, the Divinity of Christ was a doctrine. The Infallibility of the Pope is in a like situation. It was always a doctrine for always was it the belief of the Church; not till the Vatican Council was it a dogma, for not till then was it formally defined, promulgated and enforced with penalties. That is the difference, a difference not hard to grasp, but far too subtle for the brain-grapplers of theological amateurs.

But, Ladies and Gentlemen, for one evening we have had enough of biblical analysis. I now invite you to consider an argument that addresses itself to a larger circle, and bases itself on a broader though not a firmer foundation. And if in this audience, there be any man who is neither Protestant nor Catholic, but is still a believer in God and Providence, it is to him especially that I speak now.

When therefore I look out upon the world beyond Catholicity, the wide, wild world of Protestantism and infidelity, I behold a sight that fills me with a vast sorrow. I know, and even deists know, that men have been sent into the world not to discuss religion but to practise it; not to deliver controversial lectures, but to lead noble, heroic lives. Much arguing engenders much arrogance and in syllogisms there is small salvation. I know that men are essentially servants, and I know that unless their Master, the Master of this tangled universe, be a maniac, He must have given clearly and completely the rules and conditions, under which He would have His servants serve Him. So much does my sheer reason tell me. My Bible, which I need not use at all, and which I use only against my Protestant friends, tells me much more. In the 35th chap. of Isaias, I read, that in the days of Christianity, there will be in the world "a path and way, and it shall be called the holy way, and it shall be a straight way, so that fools shall not err therein." But with all this told me by my reason and by my Bible, when I look beyond Catholicity, outside my own Church, what do I find? No way and no rule fixed or definite, or certain at all. Neither Infidel nor Protestant knows what to believe or what to do. Is hell eternal or not eternal? The Doctors of Protestantism and

lity a new
men, to be
ching, that,
other. The
Nice; Mr.
ment of the
fallibility of
e for always
ouncil was it
nulgated and
ifference not
ers of theolo-

e had enough
argument that
a broader
ace, there be
but is still a
y that I speak

d Catholicity,
y, I behold a
d even deists
discuss religion
s, but to lead
arrogance and
that men are
Master, the
st have given
er which He
oes my sheer
ll, and which I
ch more. In
istianity, there
called the holy
s shall not err
d by my Bible,
urch, what do
ertain at all.
or what to do.
testantism and

Infidelity disagree. Is Jesus Christ true God or merely the most splendid specimen of men? The aforesaid doctors cannot agree. Is the Bible inspired truth or is it a mingled mass of fact and fable part poetically human, part sensually bestial, nothing heavenly divine? The doctors still differ. What God hath joined no man can put asunder, is that true, or is it rather true that what God hath joined is severable by the honorable and right honorable gentlemen who legislate for the Dominion? Among the doctors again diversity. Has each man full license to shape his own beliefs, the sciolist, according to his impudence, and the sot according to his stupidity; or is there a Church which whoso hears not is as the heathen, and is there a man who can say with St. Paul, if even an angel of heaven teach you the contrary of what I teach you, let him be anathema? Not even here are the doctors in perfect harmony. And on these matters and on other matters quite as serious, but not quite so mentionable here, have the doctors been differing ever since that first of doctors, Doctor Martin Luther did, without much trouble from examiners, take out his degrees.

Now to all these awful questions, some answers there must be. To know these answers (whether, for instance, hell is or is not eternal) is for all humanity of the most tremendous practical concern. Does any man who believes that God has made the world, has made the men that people it, rules them, loves them, wishes them to walk and work and serve Him according to His will, believe also that God has left the world powerless to have these questions solved, doomed to spend their time, and embitter their little sectarian hates, in attempting their solution? Does any man who knows that God is a God of peace and order and love, believe that He has left religion in hopeless litigation, and that He has appointed no tribunal unto which men may with certainty of satisfaction appeal? To put such questions is to answer them. Either such a tribunal God has established or the character which even reason gives Him as a God of Law and Love is all a lie. That latter supposition we do not entertain. We infer, therefore, of sheer necessity, that upon our earth some tribunal, judge of religious controversy and solver of religious doubt, is existing now. But if such a tribunal were itself liable to error it would be useless, could settle no doubt and end no controversy. Therefore, not only must such a tribunal exist, but it must be also not liable to error, that is, it must be infallible.

Upon this earth, therefore, at this very instant, there must be, if God has not abandoned the world, some infallible tribunal in religious

controversy. In the world of Protestantism and Infidelity is such a tribunal found? Not one, in these quarters, has been even so much as named—except the Bible. But the Bible, is it a tribunal at which the sore doubts of men are infallibly resolved? Why it is to the Bible that, mainly, these doubts owe their existence! It raises ghosts, but it rarely lays one. It starts problems but it rarely ends one. Long ago, even in the first days of the Reformation, did the Calvinist Wiegsheder write of it, in the sharp, straightforward Latin of his time:—

*Hic liber est in quo querit sua dogmata quisque,
Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.*

which for the ladies may be rendered, and to the ladies I dedicate the rendering—

*The Bible! That's the book where each
Seeks out the faith he's most inclined to,
And, as is fit, he finds it teach
Whatever faith he's most a mind to.*

The Bible! Why to that book we all appeal! Unitarian, Trinitarian, Lutheran, Calvinist, Anglican, Catholic, all these, though their doctrines are mutually destructive, call upon the Bible to prove these doctrines and find or think they find the Bible prompt to the call. The reason is very plain. The Bible's meaning is true, but it is not easy to discover what the Bible means. What it is supposed to mean depends very much upon the character of the supposer. Whenever I find it mentioned as a solver of religious doubts, I am forcibly reminded of a certain countryman of mine. His master and his master's friend, had been late into the night enjoying that feast of reason and flow of soul, which in the Irish climate, do sometimes produce strange slips of temper and strange lapses of memory. "What o'clock is it," was the exciting subject of their debate. It was really just midnight, but one of the gentlemen maintained it was yesterday, and the other contended it was to-morrow morning. My countryman, the servant, was called in to decide. "By gorra gentlemen," said he, on hearing the question, "I cannot decide. but sure, I'll take the candle—it's very dark, gentlemen—I'll take the candle and go look at the sun-dial." That servant may have been somewhat foolish; but there is a large suggestiveness in his folly. The sun-dial is serviceable for determining correct time as long as the sun is in the heavens. The Bible is excellent for teaching religion, as long as some heavenly light, shining on the Bible

pages, tells without fear of error what precisely the Bible means. But such a light, Protestant and Infidel have yet to discover. I say it with all due respect, but still, it is a truth only too sadly certain that in interpreting the Scriptures, no Protestant and no Infidel is very much more than poor Patt Slattery's farthing candle.

But still with the Bible's evident inability to meet the difficulty of the time, the awful moral and mental questions that perplex and pain every thinking non-Catholic so very profoundly, remain remorseless and demand a settlement. No man who believes that God is master of this universe, and loves the men who people it and detests untruth and abominates dissension, can possibly believe that that settlement is impossible. He cannot even believe that it is hard. There must be upon the earth some God-created tribunal to solve religious doubts, and end religious controversy. That tribunal must be easily accessible; its authority must be final; it must be and must be admitted to be (otherwise it can settle and end nothing) infallible. But that infallible tribunal which must be upon the earth where is it? Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, having disposed of the Bible, we have no rivals. Our Church and our Church alone, among the Churches, has always maintained her own infallibility. Therefore, as some infallible Judge of controversies, there must be—else has God kicked off the world—and as our Church alone even claims to be it, our Church must be infallible. But that Church thus proved by one large fact of thought to be infallible, has declared for the Pope's Infallibility. Therefore the Pope is infallible. But I do not care to urge that short and summary, but very satisfactory inference here. I choose to rely on a further application of the general principle I have been explaining, and I say that even had the Vatican Council never assembled no thinking and observing creature of this generation could have failed to find even from his own reason, that the Pope of Rome is infallible. In this way. Some infallible court of appeal in religious controversy, God, as we have seen, must have on the earth to-day. But such a court must be something more than infallible; it must be from its nature, able to use its infallibility in a manner suited to the exigencies of the time. Now in times past, the General Council did sufficiently well. Errors were comparatively not numerous, and, what is of more importance, they were not of rapid propagation. The Church was free. The Popes had some scrap of land to call their own. The nations that supported the Church were powerful. The Spirit of Jansenism had not spread abroad. The Papal Infallibility

was practically recognized and universally presupposed. But in our generation, all these circumstances, the last excepted, have changed. Even before the Vatican Council, the Spirit of Jansenism, that spirit of lying, and shuffling and double-dealing in order to limit the Papal prerogative, was gaining ground. The nations in whom of old the Church found some small protection, are not quite able to protect themselves. The Pope is robbed of his temporal possessions. A brutal bully holds the whole world in fear, and the bully thirsts specially for the blood of bishops. In such circumstances for a General Council to assemble, would be morally impossible. If it assembled, it would probably be soon stopped, for it would probably soon cease to be free. But even suppose it did assemble, and with the most perfect freedom, it would still be altogether unequal to the exigencies of the time. For sooner or later it should dissolve, its Bishops having each his own diocese over which to watch, and after its dissolution, the difficulties to be met and the work to be done, would still continue. And what are these difficulties? What are they! The errors without number, the heresies beyond count, the blasphemies beyond computation, which every day and hour and minute, the printing-press, and the pulpit, and the lecture-room, fling forth in floods upon the modern world! For the awful daily needs of the 19th century, a General Council, even if it could be held, is no sufficient or suitable remedy. And still God is looking on; and still His self-imposed relations towards men, bind Him to supply the world with an infallible Judge of controversy suited exactly to the time; a Judge who can decide daily, without delay, and with a voice which will command attention, whether it be heard from a palace of the Vatican or a prison of Fontainebleau. No such authority even claims to be on the earth to-day except the Pope. Therefore, the Pope is that authority. Therefore, he is the divinely appointed Judge of religious controversies in our time. But such a Judge to be at all suitable to his office, must be, as we have seen, infallible. Therefore the Pope is infallible. Either that is true or God has abandoned this 19th century to its own vast follies, and its own vast crimes; its religious shams that are unparalleled, and its religious animosities that are indescribable. That God has so abandoned the world of to-day, is a supposition which, I, alike for God's honour and for man's hopes, refuse to entertain.

And here, ladies and gentlemen, arises a thought which supplies at the same time a most striking argument for my cause and a most striking reply to a large section of its opponents. It was the fashion

ed. But in our
d, have changed.
Jansenism, that
order to limit the
ons in whom of
not quite able to
moral possessions.
the bully thirsts
umstances for a
impossible. If it
would probably
semble, and with
r unequal to the
uld dissolve, its
watch, and after
work to be done,
ties? What are
eyond count, the
and hour and
he lecture-room,
the awful daily
n if it could be
God is looking
en, bind Him to
ntroversy suited
y, without delay,
ether it be heard
eubleau. No such
except the Pope.
ne is the divinely
time. But such
as we have seen,
her that is true
own vast follies,
are unparalleled,
That God has
which, I, alike for
ain.
nt which supplies
cause and a most
t was the fashion

some time ago, in certain quarters it may be the fashion still, to pronounce the recent definition at least inopportune. But when God gives a talent, He gives the tact of using it rightly; when He made His Church infallible, He made her wise in the exercise of her infallibility. He secured her not only against error in what she said, but against imprudence in the time of her saying it. Mark the event. While a General Council suffices for all wants, and the Jansenistic efforts to limit the Papal prerogative have no success, the Church quietly assumes the Papal Infallibility, but never defines it. But suddenly, with a suddenness which to some has been both startling and scandalous, she does define it; even some of the best among her own children, like J. H. Newman, can see no necessity for the definition, and complain that those "whom the Lord hath not made sad are about to be made sorrowful;" still the Church, impelled by some secret force which the world naively confesses itself unable to understand, does define formally the Papal Infallibility; and, lo and behold! no sooner is the definition promulgated than it turns out to be just in the nick of time, for it turns out that the Pope is just being plundered of the last shred of his small estate, that Rome herself is in the hands of robbers, and that, for no man can tell how long, a General Council is a moral impossibility! Is there a thinking man who does not trace even in the time of the definition the quiet overruling finger of the Lord? And if God's finger marks the definition's opportuneness, who does not see that it marks, and with equal evidence, the definition's truth?

But some excellent persons complain that though the definition is truthful, it yet is dangerous. It has lost us Dr. Doellinger; it may lose us other doctors; it has procured, and threatens to procure for us, the bitterest persecution. Ladies and gentlemen, though we have been obliged to cut away our German Historian—and I may remark that to be a historian, especially a German historian, and to be a theological thinker require minds of very different orders—I am not sure that that eminent personage Dr. Ignatius Von Doellinger is seriously satisfied with his present position. He has indeed achieved a considerable quantity, if not of fame, at least of notoriety, and I, for one, can readily realize the difficulties he has in reading his recantation. But then to-morrow or the next day—for he is very old—he will have to do that very serious business which somehow makes the most foolhardy tremble, and the greediest gluttons of applause exceedingly careless as to how the popular breath is blowing. He will have to die. And when death's hand is on him, I am decidedly of

opinion that he will scandalize his protestant friends quite as much as Voltaire scandalized his infidel friends, screaming out despairingly for a Priest, screaming for one after all the awful infamy of sixty lying years! I often pray that Dr. Doellinger's screaming may not be answered as Voltaire's was answered, by that mocking laughter of the Lord promised when certain sinners call. If others fall away it will be their own misfortune; for us, we shall be all the better when our house is no longer troubled by the deaf and blind and lame. And of these mighty politicians whose Olympian ire is let loose against us, we are not in terror nor sore afraid. Rather, though sad for them, for ourselves we are very joyous. St. Ignatius, the immortal founder of the immortal Society of Jesus, was wont to rejoice when his followers were in trouble, for every true Jesuit, he said, would have the fate of Jesus, and that was pain and persecution from the powers that be. The remark, true certainly of the Jesuits, is, because of Christ's own prediction, true still more certainly of the Church. Because we are the one true body of Christ's followers, we are the one community which the world always agrees to hate; and mindful that the world which hates us hated Jesus also, it is to us a special mark of special divine favor, that we live in an age of special persecution. The Church of Christ, like Christ Himself, is set up for a sign to be contradicted; and if she is for the resurrection of many, she is for the ruin of many too. But she cannot fail and she cannot fear. As Eve was made from the side of the sleeping Adam, so, says a Holy Father, was the Church made from the side of the dead Christ; therefore, I add, was she ushered into existence when the sun darkened, the earth trembled, and

"The sheeted dead
Did squeak and gibber in the city streets!"

So was she born; when she comes to die it will not be by Falek laws or Gladstonian pamphlets, but only when once again the sun shall melt away for fear, and the shaken powers of the heavens shall witness that the final crash of worlds is come, and that the Great Church Militant is going—not to die, but—to join the ranks of that Church Triumphant where "nation does not rise up against nation, neither do they learn war any more." Fear! Our Church Fear! The bones of them that wait calmly in the catacombs call to her not to be afraid; the blood that sank into the sand of the Roman circus and that other blood which has made so green and glorious the grasses of Irish fields, cry to her to be dauntless; the mighty hosts of

quite as much
 but despairingly
 y of sixty lying
 y not be answer-
 er of the Lord
 way it will be
 etter when our
 d lame. And
 t loose against
 though sad for
 , the immortal
 to rejoice when
 he said, would
 ution from the
 Jesuits, is, be-
 ertainly of the
 's followers, we
 s to hate; and
 so, it is to us a
 n age of special
 nself, is set up
 resurrection of
 ot fail and she
 sleeping Adam,
 the side of the
 existence when

splendid spirits who in all ages and in all lands have witnessed for her against the world, shout to her to be strong of heart; ay, round about her do they gather, ready, if even a nerve should fail her, to go in again for the grand old cause, and once more to lead her, beautiful as of old with the blood of battle, on and on and on to victory! Fear! Our Church fear! The barque of Peter has stood up against many a storm, and against this that assails her now she will not go down. From the day that her Almighty Builder launched her forth upon that wild world-sea of the Roman Empire, every wind that blew and every robber that roved the seas has been against her; but, after all her storms and all her wars, here she is still to-day, her whole hull unhurt, every spar left standing, not a yard unbraced, not an inch of canvass blown away, her King's commission clear, her King's flag flying—the flag that braved *two* thousand years the battle and the breeze, her grey-haired captain is at his post, and now once more, as on many an eventful day, has the word gone forth—to use the thought, though not the speech, of that grand Englishman whose episcopate of Westminster has not robbed him of a heart that would have worked well at Trafalgar—now again has the word gone forth that all her cannon be shotted to the mouth, that skulkers and lubbers go down below, and—clear the decks and prepare for action! Fear! Our Church fear! Ah no, ladies and gentlemen, our Church has learned many a thing, but neither in opposing a brutal bully, nor in proclaiming the great truth that Christ's representative cannot teach Christ's Church a lie, nor in doing anything else that is her duty, though to do it brings upon her manifold sorrows, has our Church ever learned that human lesson of being afraid!

And herein, in this her dauntlessness, you have a mighty proof that her definitions are true and herself is divine. Conscious weakness and conscious falsehood are generally cowardly and always ready to accept a compromise; conscious strength and conscious truthfulness never tremble and never abate a claim. The history of the sects shows a continuous attempt to keep things comfortable; the history of the Church exhibits a resoluteness to keep things right and a majestic carelessness for the inconveniences that frequently follow the fulfilment of duty. The Fathers of the Vatican Council, Mr. Gladstone accredits with patient cunning and far-stretching designs. He will therefore allow that to the vast dangers which the definition of the Pope's infallibility would entail, they, these 800 ancients with the gathered wisdom of all lands, were not

themselves altogether blind. Many a man of them, as he gave his vote, knew that he was consigning himself to life-long persecution; all of them were well aware that the dogma which they were defining would, both against themselves and against their flocks, excite the rage of the fierce old lion that is ever hungry, would quicken the craft of the cruel old serpent that never sleeps. And still, serenely careless of the wrath of Bismarck, coldly contemptuous of the lies of Doellinger, they spoke the words that must live for ever, and sent forth the decree that can never be recalled. If this perfect self-confidence in the face of peril proves nothing, human nature has changed since the days of Dryden—

Without unspotted, innocent within,
She feared no danger, *for* she knew no sin.

Either these 800 Fathers of the Vatican defined what they knew to be the truth of God, or they were the cruellest of pastors and the silliest of men. But, ah! we have a specimen of them in Montreal. And that the brothers of the wise and noble and loving and beloved Ignatius Bourget were silly men or cruel pastors is what not even a Gladstonian pamphlet, nay, not even an Act of the British Parliament, will get one of us to believe.

Here, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the present I must make an end. My subject was a wide one, and I, in one lecture, could do it only a mite of justice. Just now, when my sense of what is due to your great courtesy compels me to close, large avenues of thought open out before me whereon perhaps walking would be much more pleasant and certainly much more easy than on these rougher roads where I have led you. This evening, had I chosen it, I might have dealt in easy generalities or addressed to you perhaps that eloquence of emotion with which no Irishman can be quite ungifted. But though in blood and brain, as in name and nation, I am Irish of the Irish, my training has lain on quite other than Irish lines, and to-night, mindful of my old masters, I set myself solemnly to do a man's work in a manly and honest and English way. Perhaps you would have liked it better had I kept the myrtle around the sword, and the glove of velvet over the hand of steel. I do not know. But I do know that I have spoken for the best as that best is shown to me; that I have spoken with all that courtesy of charity demanded of me alike by my holy faith and my sacred calling; and that whether I have spoken effectively or not effectively shall be as the Lord pleases. Only I do entertain the hope that at least some one

soul which is of the Lord's sheep, though not yet of the Lord's fold, will feel from to-night, and will be gladdened by the feeling, that it is being drawn gradually and gently on and in to that one great fold under one great Shepherd, where the sheep are sure that the herbage is healthful, and the Shepherd is sure that the sheep are safe.

APPENDIX A.

For the satisfaction of the scholarly, I give here the original Latin text of that portion of the Vatican decree, which it concerned me to quote. "Itaque Nos traditioni a fidei Christianæ exordio perceptæ fideliter inhærendo ad Dei Salvatoris nostri gloriam, religionis Catholicæ exaltationem et Christianorum populorum salutem, Sacro approbante Concilio docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus Romanum Pontificem, *cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens pro suprema sua Apostolica autoritate, doctrinam de fide aut moribus ab universa Ecclesiâ tenendam definit*, per assistentiam divinam ipsi in Beato Petro promissam ea infallibilitate pollere qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina, de fide aut moribus instructam esse voluit, ideoque ejusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ irreformabiles esse." It is needless to draw attention to the fact, that the Council here expressly explains in what sense it used the phrase *ex Cathedra*, and that for clearness and completeness the explanation is perfect. Against Mr. Gladstone, I have no prejudice whatever; for his great ability I have the sincerest respect. But then he is, as great men often are, notoriously petulant and impatient; and men of petulance and impatience have generally a tendency to be unfair to opponents. Great man as he is, he might, I think, have condescended to try to understand the Vatican Decree before trying to harm it. With the words of the Council as printed above, printed in his own pamphlet, he had the easy arrogance to write that "there is no established or accepted definition of the phrase *ex Cathedra*." But he is in sympathy with his time. We live in a generation when theology is a holiday study, and the inconvenient intelligence of ingenuous youth refutes in a day what the wrinkled thinkers of eighteen centuries have been believing. For the world at large Mr. Tennyson's prayer has not been heard.

Let knowledge grow from more to more,
But more of Reverence in us dwell.

The fate of Osee was terrible; but let us hope that sheer ignorance will, in our century, save the foolish fingers that touch the ark of the Lord.

B.

A writer in the *Montreal Witness* gravely informs the public, that in my argument, I assume the Papal Supremacy. He moreover makes a certain promise of which I now beg to remind him.

It is not my intention to occupy myself with remarks that are foolish. Still in the exercise of a Christian courtesy, which one "who belongs to no religious sect," (if such a being be possible) cannot, I fear, properly appreciate, I will put down in a couple of words the gist of my argument. In the Scriptures, I find it stated that according to Christ's arrangements, there must be some where upon the earth at this very moment some one man, a teacher of Christ's religion and infallible. As a fact, that man must be the successor of St. Peter; but for my argument it matters not whom he succeeds or whether he succeeds any one at all. The point is that such a man, a religious teacher, a teacher of Christ's religion, and infallible, must now be existing. But I find one person, and one person only claiming to be such a teacher. I infer that that person is the teacher to whom Scripture points. That inference is, I am afraid, too elliptical for the writer in the *Witness*. I will supply the suppressed reasoning. If Christ has put upon the earth an infallible teacher, and put him upon the earth to teach infallibly, it is, I apprehend, somewhat probable that that teacher knows it. If he knows it, it is, I apprehend, somewhat probable that he will not be silent about it. Now that Christ has put upon the earth such an infallible teacher my arguments prove. But though we have teachers in abundance, all are silent about their infallibility but one. That one, therefore, is the one infallible. And that one is the Pope.

All else in the letter to the *Witness*, will, I hope, be by any readers of my Lecture seen at once to be beside the mark.

Since I prepared my Lecture for the press, some other criticisms of it have appeared. These, it would be unfair to touch till the writers of them have seen the Lecture in full. But as soon as I have sufficient matter before me for an interesting reply, the reply will not be long in coming.

sheer ignorance
such the ark of

ms the public,
ey. He more-
o remind him.
marks that are
sy, which one
g be possible)
in a couple of
I find it stated
be some where
, a teacher of
must be the
tters not whom

The point is
christ's religion,
one person, and
infer that that
That inference
Witness. I will
upon the earth
teach infallibly,
ncher knows it.
le that he will
upon the earth
But though we
eir infallibility
And that one is

pe, be by any
mark.

other criticisms
touch till the
t as soon as I
reply, the reply